

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Ronnie Lee Phillips,)	Case No. 6:20-cv-04447-DCC
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
)	
Joshua P. Campbell,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's amended complaint alleging violations of his civil rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. ECF No. 20. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On May 19, 2021, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss. ECF No. 34. On June 24, 2021, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the motion to dismiss be granted and the claim against Defendant in his official capacity be dismissed. ECF No. 43. The undersigned adopted the Report on August 3, 2021. ECF No. 57.

On July 2, 2021, Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 46. Plaintiff filed a response in opposition. ECF No. 64. On September 7, 2021, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the motion for summary judgment be granted. ECF No. 66. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and

requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report, and the time to do so has lapsed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

As stated above, Plaintiff has not objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report. Accordingly, after considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.¹ Defendant's motion for summary judgment [46] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

¹ The Court notes that the Magistrate Judge did not specifically state that Plaintiff's complaint was entitled to liberal construction. However, it appears Plaintiff's claims have been liberally construed.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.
United States District Judge

October 26, 2021
Spartanburg, South Carolina